



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,750	11/30/2000	Tarri E. Furlong	SIEB026/01US	1600
25096	7590	06/29/2005	EXAMINER	
PERKINS COIE LLP			BASEHOAR, ADAM L	
PATENT-SEA			ART UNIT	
P.O. BOX 1247			PAPER NUMBER	
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247			2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/725,750

Applicant(s)

FURLONG ET AL.

Examiner

Adam L Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2178

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 05/25/04 to the original Application filed on 11/30/00 which claims benefit to the provisional application 60/168208 filed on 11/30/99.
2. Claims 1-8 have been cancelled as necessitated by Amendment.
3. Claims 9-22 have been added as necessitated by Amendment.
4. Claims 9-22 are pending in the case. Claims 9, 14, and 17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft PowerPoint 2000, 03/10/99, "Selling an Idea for a Product," pp. 1-9 (Hereafter known as "MPP2000") in view of Tso et al (US-6,421,733 07/16/02).

-In regard to independent claims 9, 14, 17 and dependent claims 16 and 20, MPP2000 teaches a computer-implemented method for generating a slide presentation for a presentation target (Page 3: i.e. Idea or Product Customer), comprising:

Art Unit: 2178

creating at least one presentation definition template (Page 9: "Selling a Product or Service" Template) having a plurality of component definitions (Pages 1-8: Slides), at least one component definition having an information bookmark (Pages 1-8: Bullet (text) and Graphic (pictures): e.g. Page 4 "List the products and features...a specific problem" and Triangle Graphics).

MPP2000 teaches wherein a user would then manually enter opportunity-specific data (Page 5: cost analysis benefits: Page 4: problem solving features) into the information bookmarks to create the slide presentation. MPP2000 does not teach mapping the information bookmark and the opportunity-specific data and automatically replacing the bookmark with the mapped data when creating the slide presentation. Markus et al teach mapping between information bookmarks (i.e. "fields") and data strings in a raw data file associated with a user (column 5, lines 1-12). Markus et al also teach automatically filling in the fields with the user data when creating the presentation (column 5, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 to have automatically replaced the information bookmarks with mapped opportunity-specific user data, because Markus et al taught that doing so would quickly and automatically fill out electronic presentations, relieving the user of the burden of manually inputting the data (column 4, lines 42-46).

-In regard to dependent claims 10 and 18, MPP2000 teaches wherein the presentation target is a potential customer Page 3: "Customer Requirements") of a sales organization (Page 1: "Selling an Idea or a Product"), and wherein the opportunity-specific data relates to potential sales opportunities (Page 7: "product, service, or idea") between the sales organization and the

Art Unit: 2178

potential customer based on (e.g. Page 5: “financial benefits” and Page 4: “solves a specific problem”).

-In regard to dependent claims 11 and 19, MPP2000 teaches a theme (Page 1: “Selling an Idea or a Product”) with the template, the theme indicating a primary decision criterion of the presentation target (i.e. Should the presentation target purchase the idea or product).

-In regard to dependent claims 12, 15, and 21, MPP2000 teaches associating a query condition with each component definition (i.e. does slide (e.g. Page 1-8) belong in the “Selling a Product or Service” Template (Page 9), the query condition determines whether the component definition was included in a slide presentation; and

determining which of the plurality of component definitions to include in the slide presentation based on the query condition (i.e. Open only the slide components associated with the “Selling a Product or Service” template (Page 9)).

-In regard to dependent claims 13 and 22, MPP2000 does not teach wherein the query condition was a predefined threshold. Markus et al teach a wherein a query condition (column 15, line 1: “use threshold”) was a predefined user threshold (column 15, lines 1-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for MPP2000 to have selected the component definitions based on a query threshold, because Markus et al teach wherein a query threshold provided the benefit of user privacy in allowing user information to be included in a presentation only when the user would have wanted it to (column 15, lines 1-50).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to cancelled claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. In general the Applicant has argued that the Power Point related references fail to teach automatically replacing information into the information bookmark. The Examiner believes the rejection as written above meet said limitations.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2178

US-5,983,227	11-1999	Nazem et al.
US-6,385,592	05-2002	Angles et al.
US-2005/0039131	02-2005	Paul, Chris
US-6,072,480	06-2000	Gorbet et al.
US-6,421,733	07/16/02	Tso et al.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER